



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,877	03/15/2004	Jose Madeira De Freitas Garcia	G&C 30566.318-US-01	1939
55895	7590	10/10/2008		
GATES & COOPER LLP HOWARD HUGHES CENTER 6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			EXAMINER ORR, HENRY W	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/800,877

Applicant(s)

GARCIA ET AL.

Examiner

Henry Orr

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2008.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3-7 and 10-14 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 3-7 and 10-14 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to applicant's amendment dated 7/24/2008.
2. Claims 3-7 and 10-14 are pending in the case.
3. Claims 1, 2, 8, 9 and 15-21 are cancelled.
4. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13 and 14 are independent claims.

Applicant's Response

5. In Applicant's response dated 7/24/2008, applicant has amended the following:
 - a) Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13 and 14

Based on Applicant's amendments and remarks, the following objections and rejections previously set forth in Office Action dated 4/24/2008 are withdrawn:

- a) Objections to claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13 and 14
- b) 35 U.S.C. 101 Rejection to claims 10-14

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 3-7 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains

subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13 and 14 recite: "a visual form on the computer comprising a hierarchical tree representation of the Sheet Sets that shows **different nodes for the Sheet Sets**".

There is no mention of the newly amended limitation in the original Specification. Thus, the limitations include subject matter that was not described in the original Specification.

If the examiner has overlooked the portion of the original Specification that describes this feature of the present invention, then Applicant should point it out (by page number and line number) in the response to this Office Action.

Applicant may obviate this rejection by canceling the claims.

Dependent claims 5 and 12 are rejected for fully incorporating the deficiencies of their respective base claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 3-7 and 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bonney et al. (hereinafter "Bonney"), U.S. Patent No. 6,466,953 B1.

Claim 3:

Bonney teaches a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program (see abstract). **(claim 3; i.e., performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program)** Examiner interprets the computer aided design application program to be capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager (see abstract).

Bonney teaches *"Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models"* (see col. 1 lines 26-30). **(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages one or more Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheets and Sheets, each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of the Subsets and the Sheets, each of the Subsets comprises a collection of the Sheets, and each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view)** Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney teaches *"where the graphical icons are interrelated to one another representing a hierarchical relationship among multiple objects of one or more sheets, and the sheets are included within a drawing by a computer aided design (CAD) application program"* (see abstract). **(claim 3; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager displays a window that presents a logical structure for the Sheet Sets, the**

Subsets and the Sheets, in a visual form on the computer comprising a hierarchical tree representation, of the Sheet Sets that shows different nodes for the Sheet Sets, the Subsets and the Sheets contained within the Sheet Sets, as well as the Sheets contained within the Subsets;)

Bonney's Figure 5 illustrates a window that presents a logical structure for a particular sheet set (e.g., Mountain Bike). The Mountain Bike sheet set contains subsets (e.g., Frame, Forks, seat, handle bar, wheels). The Mountain Bike sheet set also contains sheets (e.g., pedals, saddle, shifters). Although, Figure 5 only shows one particular sheet set. Bonney's Figure 2 clearly shows multiple sheet sets being displayed in hierarchical tree representation (i.e., 200, 206 and 214 are the root nodes for their corresponding sheet set.). Furthermore, reference numbers 200, 206 and 214 of Figure 2 are different root nodes representing different sheet sets.

Bonney teaches a CAD application displayed as a window including a title block for displaying a "page-by-page" summary of the Sheet Set, the Subsets contained within the Sheet Sets, and the Sheets contained within the Sheet Sets and the Subsets of the Sheets Sets. **(claim 3; i.e., and wherein the Sheet Set Manager is displayed as a window that includes a "Sheet List" function for displaying a page-by-page summary of the Sheet Set, the Subsets contained within the Sheet Sets, and the Sheets contained within the Sheet Sets and the Subsets.)**

Examiner interprets the Title block 410 as taught by Bonney to anticipate a "Sheet List" function for displaying a "page-by-page" summary because the title block contains "page-by-page" summary information within the drawing sheet order field 610

and WHERE USED field 615 of the Title block (see Figure 7B). Examiner notes that a summary of a sheet within the Sheet set is also a summary of the Sheet set because the Sheet set contains the sheet. Therefore, a summary of a sheet is equivalent to a summary of a subset and a summary of a Sheet Set because both subset and sheet set comprises of sheets.

Claim 4:

Bonney teaches a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program (see abstract). **(claim 4; i.e., performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program)** Examiner interprets the computer aided design application program to be capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager (see abstract).

Bonney teaches *"Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models"* (see col. 1 lines 26-30). **(claim 4; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages one or more Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheets and Sheets, each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of the Subsets and the Sheets, each of the Subsets comprises a collection of the Sheets, and each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view)** Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney teaches *"where the graphical icons are interrelated to one another representing a hierarchical relationship among multiple objects of one or more sheets,*

and the sheets are included within a drawing by a computer aided design (CAD) application program" (abstract). **(claim 4; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager displays a window that presents a logical structure for the Sheet Sets, the Subsets, and the Sheets, in visual form on the computer comprising a hierarchical tree representation of the Sheet Sets that shows the Subsets and the Sheets contained within the Sheet Sets, as well as the Sheets contained within the Subsets;)**

Bonney's Figure 5 illustrates a window that presents a logical structure for a particular sheet set (e.g., Mountain Bike). The Mountain Bike sheet set contains subsets (e.g., Frame, Forks, seat, handle bar, wheels). The Mountain Bike sheet set also contains sheets (e.g., pedals, saddle, shifters). Although, Figure 5 only shows one particular sheet set. Bonney's Figure 2 clearly shows multiple sheet sets being displayed in hierarchical tree representation (i.e., 200, 206 and 214 are the root nodes for their corresponding sheet set.). Furthermore, reference numbers 200, 206 and 214 of Figure 2 are different root nodes representing different sheet sets.

Bonney teaches a CAD application displayed as a window including a hierarchical relationship amongst graphical icons that represents drawing sheets. **(claim 4; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager is displayed as a window that includes a "View List" function for managing views of the Sheets in the Subsets and the Sheet Sets.)** Examiner interprets the displayed hierarchical relationship of the sheets as taught by Bonney to anticipate a "View List" function managing views of the Sheets

in the Subsets and the Sheet Sets because the sheets are capable of representing section views of the drawings (see col. 1 lines 26-30, col. 4 lines 41-49, Figures 2 and 5).

Claim 5:

Bonney teaches *"Designer proceeds to create drawing defining the design. Because these designs may be defined using geometric models etc...Drawings may include many details of the models such as alternative views, sections, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models"* (see col.1 lines 17-30). **(claim 5; i.e., wherein the Views are defined regions within the Sheets.)** Examiner considers the detailed views to be defined geometric regions of the drawing sheets.

Claim 6:

Bonney teaches a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program (see abstract). **(claim 6; i.e., performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program)** Examiner interprets the computer aided design application program to be capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager (see abstract).

Bonney teaches *"Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models"* (see col. 1 lines 26-30). **(claim 6; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager manages one or more Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheets and Sheets, each**

of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of the Subsets and the Sheets, each of the Subsets comprises a collection of the Sheets, and each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view) Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney teaches *"where the graphical icons are interrelated to one another representing a hierarchical relationship among multiple objects of one or more sheets, and the sheets are included within a drawing by a computer aided design (CAD) application program"* (abstract). **(claim 6; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager displays a window that presents a logical structure for the Sheet Sets, Subsets and the Sheets, in a visual form on the computer comprising a hierarchical tree representation of the Sheet Sets that shows different nodes for the Sheet Sets, the Subsets and the Sheets contained within the Sheet Sets as well as the Sheets contained within the Subsets;)**

Bonney's Figure 5 illustrates a window that presents a logical structure for a particular sheet set (e.g., Mountain Bike). The Mountain Bike sheet set contains subsets (e.g., Frame, Forks, Seat, Handle bar, Wheels). The Mountain Bike sheet set also contains sheets (e.g., pedals, saddle, shifters). Although, Figure 5 only shows one particular sheet set. Bonney's Figure 2 clearly shows multiple sheet sets being displayed in hierarchical tree representation (i.e., 200, 206 and 214 are the root nodes for their corresponding sheet set.). Furthermore, reference numbers 200, 206 and 214 of Figure 2 are different root nodes representing different sheet sets.

Bonney teaches *"It is important to note that sheets may be moved between files. For example, the sheets represented by icons 310, 320 and 330 may originally have been stored in a file while the sheet represented by icon 330 may have been stored in a separate file. After the user drags icon 330 to icon 310, the sheet represented by icon 330 is moved to the file containing the four sheets represented by icons 310, 320 and 330. Thus, a user may move sheets between files graphically"* (see col. 6 lines 13-20). **(claim 6; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager is displayed as a window that includes a "Resource Drawings" function for accessing files underlying the Sheets in the Subsets and the Sheet Sets.)** Examiner interprets moving sheets between files to anticipate the recited "Resource Drawings" function because moving the sheets as taught by Bonney involves accessing the underlying files of the Sheets in the Subsets and the Sheet Sets.

Claim 7:

Bonney teaches a graphic program such as a computer aided design application program (see abstract). **(claim 7; i.e., performing one or more functions of a Sheet Set Manager in the graphics program)** Examiner interprets the computer aided design application program to be capable of functioning as a Sheet Set Manager (see abstract).

Bonney teaches *"Drawings, in general, may include many details of the models such as, but not limited, alternate views, section views, detail views of certain aspects of each of the models"* (see col. 1 lines 26-30). **(claim 7; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set**

Manager manages one or more Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheets and Sheets, each of the Sheet Sets comprises a collection of the Subsets, each of the Subsets comprises a collection of the Sheets, and each of the Sheets comprises a drawing, layout or view) Examiner considers the drawings to be a set of drawing sheets and the section views to be subsets of the sheets.

Bonney teaches *"where the graphical icons are interrelated to one another representing a hierarchical relationship among multiple objects of one or more sheets, and the sheets are included within a drawing by a computer aided design (CAD) application program"* (abstract). **(claim 7; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager displays a window that presents a logical structure for the Sheet Sets, the Subsets, and the Sheets, in a visual form on the computer comprising a hierarchical tree representation of the Sheet Sets that shows different nodes for the Sheet Sets, the Subsets and the Sheets contained within the Sheet Sets, as well as the Sheets contained within the Subsets;)**

Bonney's Figure 5 illustrates a window that presents a logical structure for a particular sheet set (e.g., Mountain Bike). The Mountain Bike sheet set contains subsets (e.g., Frame, Forks, seat, handle bar, wheels). The Mountain Bike sheet set also contains sheets (e.g., pedals, saddle, shifters). Although, Figure 5 only shows one particular sheet set. Bonney's Figure 2 clearly shows multiple sheet sets being displayed in hierarchical tree representation (i.e., 200, 206 and 214 are the root nodes for their corresponding sheet set.). Furthermore, reference numbers 200, 206 and 214 of Figure 2 are different root nodes representing different sheet sets.

Bonney teaches a CAD application that provides a function for displaying the Sheet Sets, Subsets of the Sheet Sets and Sheets as an organized collection of graphical thumbnail properties (see Figures 2 and 5). **(claim 7; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager provides a function for displaying the Sheet Sets, Subsets of the Sheet Sets and Sheets as an organized collection of graphical thumbnail previews or properties.)** Examiner interprets the graphical icons with corresponding titles of the sheets to anticipate "graphical thumbnail properties" because the titles describe a quality or trait belonging to the corresponding individual sheet.

Claim 10-14:

Claims 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 are apparatus claims and are substantially encompassed in method claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 respectively; therefore the apparatus claims are rejected under the same rationale as method claims 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 above.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 7/24/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Prior Art Rejections

1. Applicant argues that Bonney does not describe a Sheet Set Manager that manages Sheet Sets, Subsets of Sheets and Sheets.

Instead, the hierarchical relationship shown in Figure 2 of Bonney refers only to relationships between sheets, i.e., each icon 200-218 in Fig. 2 is a sheet. For example, icons 200, 206 and 214 are merely sheets. There is no way to interpret Fig. 2 of Bonney as showing Sheet Sets containing both Subsets and Sheets, or Subsets containing Sheets, except by ignoring the definition of those terms. Certainly, Bonney itself never refers to Sheet Sets, Subsets, and Sheets, as those terms are defined in Applicants' claims and specification. (see Response pgs. 9-11)

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The claims recite a Sheet Set comprising a collection of Subsets and Sheets, each Subset comprises a collection of sheets.

Bonney's Figure 5 illustrates a window that presents a logical structure for a particular sheet set (e.g., Mountain Bike). The Mountain Bike sheet set comprises a collection of subsets (e.g., Frame, Forks, Seat, Handle bar, Wheels). Each subset comprises a collection of sheets (e.g. Wheels is a subset which comprises titanium spokes sheet and off road tires sheet). The Mountain Bike sheet set also comprises a collection of sheets (e.g., pedals, saddle, shifters).

Although, Figure 5 only shows one particular sheet set. Bonney's Figure 2 clearly shows multiple sheet sets being displayed in hierarchical tree representation (i.e., 200,

206 and 214 are the root nodes for their corresponding sheet set.). Furthermore, reference numbers 200, 206 and 214 of Figure 2 are different root nodes representing different sheet sets.

Therefore, Bonney does teach or suggest displaying Sheet Sets, Subsets, and Sheets as recited in the claims.

2. Applicant argues that Bonney does not describe a “Sheet List” function as recited in independent claims 3 and 10.

Instead, Bonney merely describes fields that are stored by the system in Bonney (see Response pgs. 11-14).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As an initial matter, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Examiner interprets the Title block 410 as taught by Bonney to anticipate a “Sheet List” function for displaying a “page-by-page” summary because the title block contains “page-by-page” summary information within the drawing sheet order field 610 and WHERE USED field 615 of the Title block (see Figure 7B). Examiner notes that a summary of a sheet within the Sheet set is also a summary of the Sheet set because

the Sheet set contains the sheet. Therefore, a summary of a sheet is equivalent to a summary of a subset and a summary of a Sheet Set because both subset and sheet set comprises of sheets. Thus, Bonney does suggest or teach a "Sheet List" function as recited in the claims.

Applicant again argues that Bonney does not show Sheet Sets containing both Subsets and Sheets, or Subsets containing Sheets (see Response p. 14).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant arguments are substantially encompassed in the first set of arguments above, therefore examiner responds with the corresponding opposing rationale as stated above.

3. Applicant argues that Bonney does not describe a "View List" function as recited in independent claims 4 and 11.

Bonney does not describe a Sheet Set Manager that is displayed as a window that includes a "View List" function for managing views of the Sheets in the Subsets and the Sheet Sets (see Response pgs. 14-15).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As an initial matter, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Bonney teaches a CAD application displayed as a window including a hierarchical representation amongst graphical icons that represents drawing sheets. For example, Bonney's Figure 5 illustrates a window that presents a logical structure for a particular sheet set (e.g., Mountain Bike). The Mountain Bike sheet set comprises a collection of subsets (e.g., Frame, Forks, Seat, Handle bar, Wheels). Each subset comprises a collection of sheets (e.g. Wheels is a subset which comprises titanium spokes sheet and off road tires sheet). The Mountain Bike sheet set also comprises a collection of sheets (e.g., pedals, saddle, shifters).

Examiner interprets the displayed sheets as taught by Bonney to anticipate a "View List" function managing views of the Sheets in the Subsets and the Sheet Sets because the sheets are capable of representing section views of the drawings (see col. 1 lines 26-30, col. 4 lines 41-49, Figures 2 and 5). Therefore, Bonney does teach or suggest a Sheet Set Manager that is displayed as a window that includes a "View List" function for managing views of the Sheets in the Subsets and the Sheet Sets as recited in the claims.

Applicant again argues that Bonney does not show Sheet Sets containing both Subsets and Sheets, or Subsets containing Sheets (see Response p. 15).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant arguments are substantially encompassed in the first set of arguments above, therefore examiner responds with the corresponding opposing rationale as stated above.

4. Applicant argues that Bonney does not describe a “Resource Drawings” tab as recited in independent claims 6 and 13 (See Response pgs. 15-16).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As an initial matter, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Furthermore, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which

applicant relies (i.e., "Resource drawings" **tab**) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant again argues that Bonney does not Sheet Sets, Subsets, and Sheets (see Response p. 16).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant arguments are substantially encompassed in the first set of arguments above, therefore examiner responds with the corresponding opposing rationale as stated above.

5. Applicant argues that Bonney does not describe allowing the viewing of Sheet Sets, Subsets, and Sheets as an organized collection of graphical thumbnail previews or properties as recited in independent claims 7 and 14.

Specifically, Fig. 5 of Bonney only includes titles for the respective sheets, but not graphical thumbnail previews or properties, as those terms are understood in the art, namely a small-size graphical representation of the underlying drawing (see Response pgs. 16-17)

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Bonney teaches a CAD application that provides a function for displaying the Sheet Sets, Subsets of the Sheet Sets and Sheets as an organized collection of graphical thumbnail properties (see Figures 2 and 5). **(claim 7; i.e., wherein the Sheet Set Manager provides a function for displaying the Sheet Sets, Subsets of the Sheet Sets and Sheets as an organized collection of graphical thumbnail previews or properties.)** Examiner interprets the graphical icons with corresponding titles of the sheets to anticipate “graphical thumbnail properties” because the titles describe a quality or trait belonging to the corresponding individual sheet.

Examiner specifically disagrees with Applicant's assertion that both thumbnail previews and properties are both understood in the art, namely as a small-size graphical representation of the underlying drawing. Instead, such assertion would only apply to a thumbnail preview. However, Examiner is not relying on Bonney to teach a thumbnail preview, but thumbnail properties. Examiner submits that a title is a property of a sheet. Figure 5 of Bonney teaches thumbnail (i.e., small-size) icons with titles. Therefore, Bonney does teach or suggest displaying Sheet Sets, Subset of the Sheet Sets and Sheets as an organized collection of graphical thumbnail properties as recited in the claims.

Applicant again argues that Bonney does not Sheet Sets, Subsets, and Sheets (see Response p. 17).

Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Applicant arguments are substantially encompassed in the first set of arguments above, therefore examiner responds with the corresponding opposing rationale as stated above.

For the foregoing reasons explained above, Examiner maintains all Prior Art Rejections.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Orr whose telephone number is (571) 270 1308. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on (571) 272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HO
10/1/2008

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176